

The first biotechnology cancer medicines have been used with surgery, chemotherapy and radiation to enhance their effectiveness, lessen adverse effects and reduce chances of cancer recurrence.

Newer biotech cancer drugs target the underlying molecular causes of the disease. Biotech cancer treatments under development, such as vaccines that prevent abnormal cell growth, may make traditional treatments obsolete. In addition, gene therapy is being studied as a way to battle cancer by starving tumor cells to death.

Many biotech drugs are designed to treat our most devastating and intractable illnesses. In many cases these medicines are the first ever therapies for those diseases. For example, advancements in research have yielded first-of-a-kind drugs to treat multiple sclerosis and rheumatoid arthritis as well as cancer.

Other medicines in clinical trials block the start of the molecular cascade that triggers inflammation's tissue damaging effects in numerous disease states. In diseases, such as Alzheimer's, Parkinson's and Huntington's, clinical trials are under way to test a variety of cell therapies that generate healthy neurons to replace deteriorated ones. Recent breakthroughs in stem cell research have prompted experts to predict cures within 10 years for some diseases, such as Type I (Juvenile) Diabetes and Parkinson's.

With more than 350 biotechnology medicines in late-stage clinical trials for illnesses, such as heart ailments, cancer, neurological diseases and infections, biotechnology innovation will be the foundation not only for improving our health and quality of life, but also lowering health care costs.

In the past two years Congress has increased funding for the National Institutes of Health's basic research programs by 15 percent per year. We are 40 percent of the way toward doubling the NIH budget. Health-care research, however, is not one-sided. The public funds we provide are for basic research. The private sector takes this basic science and then spends many times more than what the government has contributed to create new drugs and get them to patients. In today's world, biotechnology companies are among the greatest innovators and risk takers.

Biotechnology also is being used to improve agriculture, industrial manufacturing and environmental management. In manufacturing, the emphasis has shifted from the removal of toxic chemicals in production waste streams to replacement of those pollutants with biological processes that prevent the environment from being fouled. And because these biological processes are derived from renewable sources they also conserve traditional energy resources. Industrial biotechnology companies are the innovators commercializing clean technologies and their progress is accelerating at an astonishing rate.

In agricultural biotechnology, crops on the market have been modified to protect them from insect damage thus reducing pesticide use. Biotech crops that are herbicide tolerant enable farmers to control weeds without damaging the crops. This allows farmers flexibility in weed management and promotes conservation tillage. Other biotech crops are protected against viral diseases with the plant equivalent

of a vaccine. Biotech fruits and vegetables are tastier and firmer and remain fresher longer.

The number of acres worldwide planted with biotech crops soared from 4.3 million in 1996 to 100 million in 1999, of which 81 million acres were planted in the United States and Canada. Acceptance of these crops by farmers is one indication of the benefits they have for reducing farming costs and use of pesticides while increasing crop yields.

Biotech crops in development include foods that will offer increased levels of nutrients and vitamins. Benefits range from helping developing nations meet basic dietary requirements to creating disease-fighting and health-promoting foods.

Biotechnology is improving the lives of those in the U.S. and abroad. The designation of January 2000 as National Biotechnology Month is an indication to our constituents and their children that Congress recognizes the value and the promise of this technology. Biotechnology is a big word that means hope.

HONORING LARRY LEDERHAUSE

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 2000

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to pause and remember the life of Larry Lederhause who passed away on December 11, 1999. Many relatives and close friends will miss this remarkable person.

Larry Lederhause was born on January 30, 1963. He attended Eagle Valley Junior/Senior High School in Gypsum, Colorado. He was very involved in 4-H and Future Farmers of America projects. He served as a volunteer with the Gypsum Fire Department. Larry attended college in Oregon at Western Baptist College.

Larry returned to Colorado and worked for the Garfield County Airport. He then owned and operated L&L Sanitation Service.

Larry loved animals, especially his dog, Happy. Larry also sang with the "Sagebrush Singers" of the Battlement Mesa and liked to go hunting, hiking, swimming and flying.

It is with this, Mr. Speaker, I would like to remember Mr. Larry Lederhause, a great American who was loved and cherished by many.

THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION STATEMENT IN REFERENCE TO CERTAIN TYPES OF RELIGIOUS BROADCASTING

HON. CHARLES W. "CHIP" PICKERING

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 2000

Mr. PICKERING. Mr. Speaker, in December of last year, the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) overstepped its bounds and authority by issuing statements that if enforced, would restrict certain types of religious broadcasting.

I am happy to report that the FCC reversed its decision on Friday. I applaud the decision

of the FCC but am troubled that such a decision was ever made.

While issuing a ruling on a routine license transfer, the FCC editorialize about new, strict standards for educational programming that could have affected many non-commercial, educational television broadcasters. The FCC stated that "religious exhortation, proselytizing, or statements of personally-held religious views and beliefs generally would not qualify as 'general education' programming. Thus, church services generally will not qualify as 'general education' under our rules."

It is arrogance of the highest form for the FCC to attempt to determine what is—and what is not educational. The FCC's statements amount to an unconstitutional restriction on religious speech. This type of content regulation and suppression of religious expression is not acceptable. The FCC is neither qualified nor does it have any legal authority to engage in this sort of line drawing.

The FCC was established by the Communications Act of 1934 and is charged with regulating interstate and international communications by radio, television, wire, satellite and cable. The FCC's jurisdiction covers the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and U.S. possessions. The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) is an independent United States government agency, directly responsible to Congress.

Shortly after reading the FCC's anti-religious statements, Reps. MIKE OXLEY, STEVE LARGENT, CLIFF STEARNS and I wrote the Chairman of the FCC to remind him that the FCC is still directly responsible to Congress and that he should reverse the anti-religious statements or he could stand by and see it overturned by Congressional action.

Last week, we introduced H.R. 3525—The Religious Broadcasting Freedom Act to overturn the ruling issued by the FCC and did so with over 60 cosponsors. The FCC is accountable to the Congress and I believe we have demonstrated that we will take decisive action when the FCC or any other federal agency exceeds its authority—and especially when such actions threaten our religious freedoms.

The FCC's action was an unprecedented action by a government agency in an attempt to decide what is acceptable religious programming and content. The fact is, it is not the place of any government agency to determine what is acceptable religious speech because religious freedom and freedom of speech are both protected by the Constitution.

I have heard from many religious broadcasters in Mississippi and across the country who expressed outrage at the FCC and their actions. I am pleased to tell them that we have stopped this un-Constitutional decision in its tracks. Yet, I urge my colleagues to remain vigilant. I assure you that if the FCC takes any actions that suggest they may attempt to pursue this action in any other format, I will fight it once again.